

cannot afford to let down our guard. And nowhere is this more important than in the case of the free market economy. If it is going to be restored in Russia we certainly do not want to see it weakened here. And if Communism continues to be fettered on Russia the case for opposing any semblance of similar controls here is all the stronger.

Most of you, I feel sure, are convinced believers in Free Enterprise, not only for the United States but as the most desirable worldwide system of exchange. Being human your belief is doubtless sometimes affected by your immediate interests, in such matters as a desire to have your particular business protected by tariffs. This illogic, on the part of those who resent other instances of governmental intervention, is not admirable. But I do not think it seriously undermines the general business faith in the material advantages of a free, competitive market.

I have been arguing, with Madison, that the spiritual quality in true self-government is an essential part of our Design for Freedom. In closing I would like to emphasize that this is just as true in economic as in political affairs. All life is a matter of constant selection between alternatives. The free market permits us to choose, in daily living, at the lowest competitive price, between superior and inferior products. Under a planned economy we must accept, at a fixed price, whatever the planners have decided to make available. Can there be any doubt as to which system responds the more readily, not only to purchasing power but also to the personal morality of a people?

Of course the free market is basically only a mechanism. It is like an automobile which, with equal efficiency, carries the doctor on his errand of mercy or the gunman away from the scene of his holdup. The free market will, and does, produce pornography more readily than copies of the *Federalist*, when smut is what Americans want. Few of us, however, object to reasonable controls by government over products clearly corruptive of health or morals. That is a part of the necessary police power. But we must always remember that every exercise of State control reduces by that much the right and duty of self-control. It may be in the interest of public order, but is inevitably at the expense of individual freedom.

The market mechanism, we should more fully realize,

reflects a faith in freedom that is traditionally American, and which the Socialists completely lack. It demands that men and women choose for themselves—not only in moments of crisis, but continuously. If some are slaves by nature, as Aristotle argued, then the planners are partially justified; by definition the slave is one who is deprived of freedom of choice. But if men have slowly made themselves worthy of freedom, as our forefathers thought, then we must view the free market as the outward and cogent expression of that faith.

To defend the market mechanism is, therefore, to defend values more important than the free enterprise system, or the institution of private property, fundamental though these may seem. It is to defend the substance of self-government, from which our surface assets spring. To defend the free market, indeed, is to align oneself with a lofty as opposed to a degraded conception of the nature of man. It is a defense of Freedom, against the re-establishment of Slavery.

Events have made it our fate to participate in this epic struggle, of which the hectic military rivalry between ourselves and Soviet Russia seems to me only a small and secondary part. Unfortunately we do not, and cannot, have full understanding of all that is at stake for the future. Immersed in our daily problems, and handicapped by superficial education, we have largely lost that capacity for fundamental thinking that was so outstanding among those who framed our form of government. They did the job so well that we were inclined to think it would automatically survive forever.

That was a sad mistake. No business can be so well designed that it will operate over the years without continuous, critical supervision. Much less is that the case with a Design for Freedom admittedly constructed on a faith in "mankind's capacity for self-government." We need no electronic computers to tell us that this faith is weakening, and that on this weakness Communism builds.

To renew faith is now clearly our primary task, and one that Washington cannot do for us. The fount from which faith comes can never be replenished by a T.V.A., nor even defended by the Pentagon. On the other hand it has not yet, nor ever will, run dry.

As we go out into the glittering streets this evening we could well remember that back of all the gaudy artificialities the true Design for Freedom is still discernible.

How To Sell America

INSTEAD OF GIVING IT AWAY

By CHARLES H. BROWER, President, Batten, Barton, Dustine & Osborn, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Delivered before The Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan, November 6, 1961

ONE DAY last summer, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, Vice President of the United States, returned from making good will abroad. And having again set foot in his native country once more, Mr. Johnson gave forth the following piece of wisdom:

The United States has not sold itself to the world.

"A nation that knows how to popularize corn flakes and luxury automobiles certainly ought to be able to tell the world the simple truth about what it is doing and why it is doing it," lamented the Vice President.

Now you and I, and all of us in advertising and selling, have heard this same complaint over and over again. Why are we, who are so good at selling soap, so poor at selling

ourselves? Why are we, who are so expert at moving packaged goods, so ineffective at moving men's souls?

These are, indeed, very important questions.

For your country and mine is operating today in the most competitive market that history has ever seen . . . and for the biggest prize that history has ever bestowed.

The United States is competing for the minds of men across the world in nearly a hundred lands. If there were a Nielsen audit, our sales curve would cause alarm in the office of any sales manager. Our share of market is decreasing.

Yet selling ideas is supposed to be our great strength. There must be something wrong somewhere, and there is.

Even a tiny commercial enterprise would hesitate to try to

operate without a sales manager or a director of advertising. Corn flakes are not sold by the president of the cereal company. Automobiles are not sold to the consumer by the president of Chrysler, Ford or General Motors. In every case, there is a sales staff, and an advertising staff in the office, and a larger staff in the field.

Yet the United States—the largest enterprise in the world—has long been content to leave all sales functions up to its President, who is already overburdened with more assignments than ten men could reasonably undertake.

We need a sales manager. We need an advertising manager. And we need a staff in the field—and the field in this case is the whole world. And either we ought to get it, or we ought to stop asking why we can sell corn flakes and not democracy. And we ought to stop wondering why our international sales curve continues to drop—month by month and year by year.

Washington is not threatened by any shortage of people trained in the selling of ideas, by the way. The last time I counted there were 77 different public-relations departments and press bureaus in the government. Even the Supreme Court has one.

These departments and bureaus are dedicated to survival—but not necessarily to your survival or mine. They are dedicated to the survival of their departments and bureaus—to the various armed services, to the Bureau of the Budget, T.V.A., the Bureau of Census and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There are also more than 800 registered lobbyists, each expert in selling ideas, each dedicated to a limited, although probably worthy, goal. And I am not accusing any of these public-relations departments, press bureaus, or lobbyists of any lack of patriotism when I say that I think you will find no group entirely dedicated to the United States as a whole.

I think there should be such a department . . . a department dedicated wholly to selling the United States to other nations and—just as importantly—to itself.

It intrigues one—does it not?—to speculate upon how little our Soviet enemies must spend upon the public relations of interdepartmental rivalries? And it is just as interesting to speculate about how much public-relations power might be generated here, if the effort now spent on jockeying for position might be lumped together in one vast campaign against our enemy.

I do not wish to mislead you. There is some attempt being made today at selling the United States to the world—the U.S.I.A., which operates "The Voice of America" and maintains information centers throughout the world. Its annual appropriation is somewhat less than the advertising expenditure of our leading soap manufacturer. And with this tin-cup budget it is supposed to influence more than 90 countries.

There is an old advertising saying: A smart dime can never beat a dumb dollar. In this case, our dime, however smart, is no match for a flood of reasonably bright rubles.

It is not at all surprising that good people tackle the job of heading the U.S.I.A. and less surprising that they abandon it. This agency has been under the leadership of four different men in the past seven years. Its current head is Edward R. Murrow, a man of unquestionable sincerity, but devoted, until his recent appointment, to publicizing the seamy side of life in our country rather than the sunny side.

There is also Radio Free Europe, centered in Munich and broadcasting effectively beyond the Iron Curtain. Radio Free Europe is supported by private funds. If psychological war is war—and it is—this is much like having an Army supported by private funds. And the reason for this is most revealing: not being controlled by the government, it does not have to pull its punches.

We have long since found that the enemy does not fight by the Marquis of Queensberry rules. We have learned something

from this as far as our combat troops are concerned, and we teach them to fight the way the enemy fights—it's the only way to survive.

But we have not yet learned that lesson in the war for men's minds. We must learn it—as much as it goes against our national grain. We owe it to the rest of the world not to die from being too noble!

As its name implies, Radio Free Europe is limited to just one theater of mental warfare. A world of uncommitted countries—the ones who constantly confuse us with colonialism, the ones who need the truth most—is well beyond its reach.

Now if I might for a moment borrow that convenient visitor, the man from Mars . . . if he were intelligent, he would quickly see that the war for minds is being lost for lack of leaders, lack of people and lack of money.

But he would also, perhaps, see a possible solution. For more than twenty years the Advertising Council—an organization composed of advertisers, media and advertising agencies has worked to help our country at home. Last year its members contributed \$182 million worth of advertising to such causes as defense-bond sales, the United Campaign and Red Cross drives. It helped take the census, helped get out the vote. It worked to increase teachers' salaries, to increase school capacities. And a dozen other projects.

Here is proof that advertising can be used to sell ideas. Here are men who have proved that they are willing to work for their country and that they can work effectively. They have asked for no credit. They will be embarrassed that I mention them here.

And I do not even suggest that the Advertising Council be used. I merely point out that our government needs help, and that people trained in advertising can give that help. The job, of course, is infinitely more complex than anything advertising has yet tackled. But is it not a sensible place to start?

Surely, our visitor would say, here is a natural alliance. A great problem. But a present solution. There is no longer any reason for America to be cuffed about in world affairs. There is no reason why Russian should beat Uncle Sam to the draw every time. Let the country use its trained advertising skills quickly.

Alas, I am afraid that is the end of *that* happy movie reel—and we must go from reel to reality. It does not seem likely that the government will grasp the bright sword of our creative skills and wield it against the enemy.

I cannot remember the latest ruling on wire tapping, but let's tap the Washington-New York-Harvard wire anyway and see what's buzzing.

Voice 1: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.: There is an alliance between the big producers, who live by the creation of consumer wants, and the big advertisers, who have mastered the technology of creating wants where none existed before.

Voice 2: Kenneth Galbraith: The advertising man is a man who devises a nostrum for a nonexistent need, and then successfully promotes both.

Voice 3: (Long distance from England) Dr. Arnold Toynbee: Advertising is not only un-Christian, but basically un-American.

Voice 4: Alvin H. Hanson, Professor Emeritus of Political Economy, Harvard: Advertising is a form of inverted education to make people believe things that are not so.

Had I more time and more patience, I could let you listen in on Governor Brown of California, Senator Church of Idaho, Dean Rusk, Chester Bowles and a number of other interesting voices.

But perhaps it is enough to conclude with Arthur Miller, the playwright: "When a thing becomes commercial, it becomes an enemy of man."

over the globe. They were briefed on the new pitch for next year. Their goals were spelled out. Their product was glowingly displayed and described. They were given pep talks and sales quotas and deadlines. It was the Communist Party Congress, and don't kid yourself or me—they mean business.

What is our answer? It has to be something better than scratching our heads and saying, "I wonder what Jack is going to do about *that*."

My answer is that we hold a sales convention of our own . . . in Washington. The sooner the better.

My answer is that freedom is a commodity beyond price . . . the most valuable thing that man has ever produced. If it is going to be saved . . . and it must be . . . we are the ones who must save it. Now. Our duty as Americans is clear: we must sell America . . . instead of giving it away.

Thank you.

The Communist Conspiracy

ACHIEVING PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE MENACE WE FACE

By JOHN B. CONNALLY, *Secretary of the Navy, United States*

Delivered to the Ohio Valley Lawyers' Seminar on "The Tactics and Strategy of the Communist Conspiracy," Cincinnati, Ohio, December 8, 1961

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Many of us are less accustomed than you to the sound of the name "Cincinnati." We who do not hear "Cincinnati" many times every day are carried back, through that name and its associations, to our own American Revolution. You need, I am sure, no visiting Texan to remind you that your city takes its name from that hereditary society of officers of the Continental Line of the Revolutionary Army—the Society of the Cincinnati. You might profit, however, from a reminder that the danger now facing our Nation, and you and me as individuals, is greater than that confronted by the founders of the Society whose name you have taken. As President Kennedy stated in Seattle only last month:

" . . . More than any other people on earth, we bear burdens and accept risks unprecedented in their size and duration, not for ourselves alone but for all who wish to be free. No other generation of free men in any country has ever faced so many and such difficult challenges."

Your attendance at this first regional Seminar on Communist Tactics and Strategy is, of course, related to these unprecedented risks and challenges of which the President spoke. The Seminar itself is predicated upon the proposition that in a democratic society, an informed public is necessary for effective and sustained national action. A further premise is that the American public including, I am afraid, the legal profession, is inadequately informed on the subject of Communist tactics, strategy and objectives—a premise which I am sure you are prepared to accept after hearing Dr. Elliott, Dr. Lowry and Professor Lipson earlier today.

The task of achieving public understanding of the menace we face is immense. The relatively simple answers applicable in other wars we have known avail us little in today's cold war conflict. The issues are complex—the conflict protracted and almost infinitely varied—and the methods used by our adversary obscure and devious. The totality of the struggle is staggering. It encompasses diplomacy—trade—economics—law—religion—ideology—subversion—war and peace—propaganda—science—in short, the entire spectrum of human endeavor. Yet understanding must be achieved—understanding both of the nature and scope of the Communist menace and of our own principles and aspirations. If understanding is *not* achieved, you must expect either misguided action born of frustration, or surrender born of terror.

In simple terms, a vast amount of homework is necessary. We cannot expect this homework to be done spontaneously. People must be alerted to the peril. They must be urged and

they must be led. This is a fight against apathy—the same type of apathy which caused us to ignore Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in the '30's—an apathy for which we, and the entire world paid an incalculable price.

We must not and cannot repeat this mistake. The tools for achieving comprehension are not lacking. The very history of the communist conspiracy with its treacherous tactics of tyranny and terror and its enslavement of nation after nation should give some clue to its basic nature. In less than 44 years, what Churchill has called "the long night of barbarism" has descended upon almost a billion people. This should give a hint as to its capacity.

But we need not predicate our study of the objectives of the international communist conspiracy on past performance alone. In the words of Job, "Oh that mine adversary had written a book." Well he has! And not only *one* book. Leading Communists from Lenin to Khrushchev have told us in unmistakable—and what is more important—consistent—terms exactly what is their goal. That goal is nothing less than the complete domination of the entire world, including of course the United States.

The most recent—and one of the most comprehensive—expressions of those goals appears in the Manifesto of the 81 Communist Parties—which was issued in Moscow last December—and Khrushchev's 2½ hour speech of 6 January 1961, which interpreted the Manifesto. President Kennedy could only have had these documents in mind when, during his State of the Union Message earlier this year, he referred to Soviet ambitions as having been forcefully restated only a short time previously.

Secretary of State Rusk has stated:

"I personally believe that as many Americans as possible should read this January 6th speech of Mr. Khrushchev's carefully and with the utmost seriousness."

Yet how many Americans *have* read these explicit plans for our demise? Probably, percentage wise, more lawyers than members of other groups of our society—but still not enough! If more lawyers than members of the general public have read and understood these documents, much of the credit must go to the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives of the A. B. A. which prepared last May a report containing the full text of these papers and an interpretive analysis. Speaking now as a lawyer, I would like to congratulate Mr. Satterfield and the Committee for taking the lead in effecting distribution of this report throughout the Bar. I noticed that the Committee included both the Manifesto of last December and the Khrushchev speech in

I am not going to discuss the economic stupidity of such views today. I merely point out that these people are attempting to dismantle our only possible propaganda apparatus just when we need it most. It is much as though they had decided to disarm the U. S. Navy.

Please understand me—I give these men credit for being sincere and patriotic and wholly unsympathetic to the enemy. Unfortunately, it makes little difference. For it is perhaps more dangerous to have an idiot for a friend than for an enemy.

I think I know what is wrong with these people. Their common denominator is sophistication . . . or oversophistication.

Every such person has a sentimental nostalgia for a world he never knew—a primitive world. A world of handmade artifacts and hand-drawn water. A Walden pond. A spare, spare, virtuous world of plain living and high thinking.

To such people, the current affluence of our country can be little short of appalling. For once you fall for the idea that there is something spiritual about scarcity, it follows that there is something brutalizing about plenty. Material success must then be the result of materialistic goals. And there has to be something nasty about a society where the feeding problem is overeating instead of starvation.

The answer in the minds of these sophisticated souls is simple. Americans admittedly buy more than they need to keep dry, warm and alive. So stop their buying and you will almost overnight have a virtuous society again—a society where spiritual values regain their hold and everyone is noble.

How to stop their spending? Too late now to stop the wage spiral that created the great margin of expendable income. So stop the evil influence of Madison Avenue, the street where the persuaders hide.

True, the machinery in factories may begin to rust a bit. The mines will close down. The highways will develop potholes. But long before the taxes dry up, the state will take over. And surely a small dash of tyranny is preferable to this overfed, overbedded, air-conditioned life where a millworker can own more than one car and the grandson of an Irish saloonkeeper can become President.

I suspect that you and I—being less sophisticated—look at advertising in a different light. I regard it as the first essential in any economy based on competition and freedom of choice. I believe that it brought the bathroom in from the back yard, put the medicine cabinet in the bathroom and put the toothbrush in the medicine cabinet. I believe it freed our women from drudgery and lifted all of our living standards beyond anything the world has seen—or is likely to see again. I believe it generates the business that pays the taxes that enable us to hire Schlesinger and Galbraith. And I believe that advertising and advertising alone furnishes the financial strength that keeps our free press free.

One of the things our dandy little dreamers forget is how America was made. It was settled by wave after wave of immigrants who were fighting to escape the very kind of primitive living that they espouse. These immigrants found the simple life neither spiritual nor ennobling. And every successive generation has been moved by one overriding ambition—to give its children a better life than it enjoyed.

This ambition has been the mainspring of our progress. This refusal to be stratified or satisfied, this urge for new and better things—for better houses on better streets—was a dominant American phenomenon when cows were grazing on Madison Avenue.

But, gentlemen, I have never been one to bear a grudge for long. So I will make a deal with Messrs. Schlesinger, Galbraith, Toynbee—and all the other Messrs. I will admit that advertising is often vulgar, loud, tiresome, dull, repetitious,

boring, long-winded and repulsive . . . if they will admit that it is vital to a free economy.

Then we can get on with the big answer to Mr. Johnson's big question: How *would* advertising go about selling America as well as selling corn flakes?

First, we must realize that psychological war—call it cold war, if you will—or a war of nerves—wins victories just as important, just as historical and just as permanent as a shooting war.

Our effort in this field must cease being a part-time job—or a short-change job.

The job to be done is so important that it must have the authority and the status of a department with a secretary in the President's Cabinet.

Since Americans have an instinctive dislike and distrust of the word "propaganda," let us never use that. Our new department will be called the Department of World Affairs.

Just as the State Department deals with the world's statesmen, the Department of World Affairs will deal with the people of the world. It will drain from their minds the poison of Soviet lies and tell them the truth about America.

Its European, African, Asian and South American desks will be manned by a combination of Americans trained in advertising techniques, and by what might be called a Peace Corps in reverse.

Every year the brightest young minds from most of the countries we wish to talk to come to America to school. Shortly their great objective becomes *staying* here. They extend their visas by thinking up new courses; they marry Americans; they pull strings; they do whatever they can to stay here.

Why not encourage these young people who appreciate America so much? Encourage them to go home to their native lands and help us for a while in selling America to their people. If at some future date they wanted to return here, they would be most welcome.

Among other things, the Department of World Affairs would follow our foreign aid abroad, seeing that we got credit of the right sort instead of discredit. It would throw a spotlight of publicity on anything that looked like waste and foolishness.

It might even help to educate us—for *one* of the reasons we cannot sell the United States abroad is that too few of us salesmen really know our product.

Where would all of the money come from? There's that money I mentioned now being spent on interdepartmental publicity warfare. And there is always the possibility that less military expenditure would be needed if more of the world were on our side.

But suppose we needed a special appropriation that might even call for increased taxes? Mr. Kennedy in his inaugural address called for sacrifices. Who would not sacrifice a little to help with a job so vital to our security and to the security of the whole world?

For any good job of selling America would not just combat slander, not just clear our name, not just defend. It would give a pattern that other less privileged peoples could adapt to their own needs—a pattern of a dynamic, fluid, working democracy—economic as well as political.

The more people who understand America, the better chance for the survival in the world of everything America stands for.

And who will understand America until the job of making America understood is put into the hands of people who know how to sell?

Gentlemen, a sales convention has just wound up in Moscow. Sales managers were flown in from branch offices all